

was marked up in committee last week?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. While that is still under discussion, it is unlikely.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to indicate that the Republicans have repeatedly been trying to close the terrorist loophole in our FISA laws with our previous-question votes over the last several weeks. And I would ask the gentlewoman, first of all, why the fix to the terrorist loophole was not put into the conference report that we just voted on, the 9/11 conference report? And after that, what is preventing this important national security legislation from coming to the floor? And I would ask the gentlewoman if it could be added to next week's schedule.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We are looking at various options to address that concern, and it is possible that will occur next week.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, I would just like to reiterate the concern to the gentlewoman, Madam Speaker, that it was August of 2001 in which, unfortunately, we had experienced an increase in terrorist chatter, and that was in all the reports, and likely, hopefully, never again will that happen to the United States and its citizens, a terrorist attack at all or, God forbid, on that scale.

Given the reports lately and the fact that there is increasing chatter among the various reports coming out of different sources, I would just like to reiterate the importance of that type of legislation to the gentlewoman and the desire on the part of the Republicans to see that legislation come to the floor.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I thank my friend from Virginia for his comments, and we certainly couldn't agree more on the importance of that. We have been looking at various ways that we can address those concerns. The majority is absolutely concerned about addressing the whole issue of terrorism and making sure that we can close every possible loophole that might be slipped through by a terrorist.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and ask one final question.

The House approved legislation earlier this month to reform the activities at the FDA, including reauthorization of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act and the Medical Device User Fee Act. Without reauthorization, the FDA will be forced to send out notices to reduce staffing. In other words, we will have to lay off government employees. It is my understanding that the FDA will send these notices as early as August if Congress fails to reauthorize the user fee programs next week.

I would ask the gentlewoman, how does the majority plan to complete these important bills before we adjourn next week?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We think the gentleman's characterization

of the timing of that is a bit of a stretch. We do believe that that is an important issue to address. With the ambitious agenda that we have next week and the priorities that have been laid out, it is unlikely that we will get to the FDA issue next week, but we will be dealing with it as soon as possible.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just respond, Madam Speaker, that there is a projected over 2,000-employee layoff if we in this Congress do not act to make sure that reauthorization occurs, and that is something that I am sure the gentlewoman will agree we do not want to see happen.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We certainly do not, which is why we plan to make that a priority and deal with it as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentlewoman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 30, 2007

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

U.S. CHARITIES HELP HAMAS

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, it seems the terrorist group Hamas may have been receiving money from a U.S.-based fake charity organization that funds Hamas's reigns of terror in the Middle East, all under the hypocritical name of compassion and goodwill. A Dallas, Texas, Muslim charity has been charged with pouring millions of dollars into a terrorist slush fund that is bent on destroying Israel and the United States.

While the charity denies any wrongdoing, of course, prosecutors say money went straight to Hamas and some of the money went to aid families of suicide bombers. But this self-righteous "charity" says they are innocent.

The charity claims they were sending money for humanitarian efforts in Pal-

estine. Madam Speaker, the fanatical terrorist group Hamas is not a humanitarian organization. They kill humanitarians.

If nonprofit organizations in the United States are aiding terrorist organizations in their devastation, destruction, and death, they should be held accountable. If this charity is a fraud, then the money should be confiscated and given to victims of terrorism. And then the charity organizers ought to go to jail.

And that's just the way it is.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

GENERAL PETRAEUS'S REPORT ON THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, many of my colleagues are eagerly waiting for General Petraeus's report on the situation in Iraq this September. But I don't know why we are waiting because we have already heard from General Petraeus in September; September of 2004, that is.

On September 26, 2004, General Petraeus wrote an op-ed piece in The Washington Post giving his assessment of the situation in Iraq at that time. I think it would be very constructive for us to review that article, and I would like to read pieces from it.

Near the beginning General Petraeus says: "Eighteen months after entering Iraq, I see tangible progress. Iraqi security elements are being rebuilt from the ground up. The institutions that oversee them are being reestablished from the top down. And Iraqi leaders are stepping forward, leading their country and their security forces courageously . . ."

He goes on to recognize that the Iraqis face a violent insurgency, but he says: "Nonetheless, there are reasons for optimism . . . Iraqi police and soldiers . . . are performing a wide variety of security missions. Equipment is being delivered. Training is on track and increasing in capacity. Infrastructure is being repaired. Command and control structures and institutions are being reestablished."

And after citing many other examples of progress, the general ended his piece this way: "I meet with Iraqi security force leaders every day . . . I have seen their determination and their desire to assume the full burden of security tasks for Iraq. There will be more tough times . . . along the way. Iraqi security forces are, however, developing steadily and they are in the fight. Momentum has gathered in recent months. With strong Iraqi leaders